



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/465,081	12/16/1999	JOHN L. BEEZER	3797.84608	8435

28319 7590 04/07/2004

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET, N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/465,081

Applicant(s)

BEEZER ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-28 and 30-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 01/16/2004 to the original application filed 21/16/1999.
2. Claims 1-34 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 15, 28, and 32 are independent claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/26/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "the document" (page 2, line 4).

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Dependent claims 2-14 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of its base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-17, 19, 21, 23, 25-28, 30, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chen et al.** (U.S. 6,625,624 – filed 12/1999 – Provisional application 60/133,345 – filed 05/1999).

As to **independent claim 1**, Chen teaches a method of invoking system commands from a mark-up language document associated a computer running an operating system and having predefined system commands (*Abstract*), the method comprising the steps of:

- locating an alias within the link; and identifying a predefined system command associated with the alias (*the URL ... can be extended to include additional commands ... URL?iproxy&command where “?iproxy” is a keyword, and “command” is a service; col.3, line 61-col.4, line 13*); and

- executing the predefined system command associated with the alias (*forwards the command to ihttpd 2026 which, in turn, forwards the command to icmd 2028 for processing; col.4, lines 1-13 & Fig.2*).

Chen does not explicitly teach “receiving an indication that is a link in the document has been selected.” Chen, however, teaches “*a client 60 requests information from a server 70 by sending a request to the server; col.3, lines 9-10*”.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Chen for receiving an indication that is a link in the document has been selected in order to provide means for directing the user to the desired web pages.

As to dependent claims 2, 5, and 7, Chen teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instruction (*Fig.1*).

As to dependent claim 3, Chen teaches the computer-executable instructions are within an application program (*col.2, lines 59-67 and Fig.2*).

As to dependent claim 4, Chen teaches in response to the step of executing, revisiting the first content of the link to display a second content (*col.9, lines 5-30*).

As to dependent claims 6 and 17, Chen teaches reading an instruction located within the link and wherein steps (c) and (d) are performed if the instruction is to invoke a system command (*col.4, lines 4-13 and Fig.3*).

As to dependent claims 8 and 21, Chen teaches the predefined system command is selected from, among other things, network operation (*Fig.3 and associated text*).

As to dependent claims 10 and 23, Chen teaches the predefined system command is selected from the group consisting of Network Lookup and Network Search (*col.4, lines 36-52*).

As to dependent claims 12 and 25, Chen teaches the predefined system command is Load Value (*Fig.3*).

As to dependent claims 13 and 26, Chen does not teach the predefined system command corresponds to an applet for a third-party application, although Chen teaches interface written in Java, well known to be programming language for applets (*col.5, lines 30-59*). Moreover, third party applications running as applets in standard web browsers were well known at the time of the claimed invention, as were the benefits of portability and added functionality over the web the applets provided. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the predefined system command correspond to an applet for a third party application.

As to dependent claims 14 and 27, Chen teaches the mark-up language document is an HTML document (*Fig.4 and associated text*).

Independent claim 15 is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 16, Chen does not teach “the alias is an integer.” However, it was well known in the art at the time of to claimed invention to use integers for identify commands because the integer data type could be stored and transmitted more efficiently than, for example, a string containing a command or command name. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the alias an integer.

As to dependent claims 19 and 30, Chen teaches a plurality of aliases and corresponding predefined system command for each of the aliases (*col.4, lines 1-52 / Fig.3 and associated text*).

Independent claim 28, the rejection of independent claim 15 above is incorporated herein in full. However, claim 28 further recites “an instruction within the link to invoke a system command.”

Chen teaches an instruction within the link to invoke a system command (*col. 4, lines 1-13*).

Independent claim 32, the rejection of independent claim 15 above is incorporated herein in full. However, claim 28 further recite: “an operating system; a mark-up language document; and an application program running on the operating system for displaying the mark-up language document.”

Chen teaches a mark-up language document (*e.g., HTML; col. 4, lines 36-46*); and an application program running on the operating system for displaying the mark-up language document (*a browser; col. 2, lines 59-67*). “An operating system” is inherent to the system of Chen.

As to dependent claim 34, note the rejection of claims 19 and 30 above. However, claim 34 further recites “a table stored in a second memory device”.

Chen teaches a table stored in a second memory device (*Fig. 1*).

6. Claims 9, 11, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of **Humpleman et al.** (U.S. 6,288,716 – filed 06/1998), as cited in the previous Office Action.

As to dependent claims 9 and 22, Chen does not teach “the predefined system command is selected from the group consisting of Brightness, Contrast, Page Color, Rotate, Visual Guides, All Annotations, Bookmarks, Highlights, Notes, Drawings, and Riffle Increments.”

Humpleman teaches the predefined system command is selected from, among other things, network Brightness (*col.8, lines 9-16*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and Humpleman because Humpleman’s teaching would have provided the enhance capability for permitting control actions to be implemented by running programs and scripts on the device itself.

As to dependent claims 11 and 24, Chen does not teach “the predefined system command is selected from the group consisting of Form Post.”

Humpleman teaches the predefined system command is selected from the group consisting of Form Post (*col.8, lines 16-18*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and Humpleman because Humpleman’s teaching would have provided the enhance capability for permitting control actions to be implemented by running programs and scripts on the device itself.

7. Claims 20, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA)**.

As to dependent claims 20 and 31, Chen does not “teach the mark-up language file is an e-book.”

APA teaches the mark-up language file is an e-book (*E-books are electronic publications 'such as books, journals, magazines, etc.' that can be viewed using computer-based display devices; Specification, page 3, lines 1-9*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and APA because APA's teaching would have provided the capability for creating pages of the small size at the big volume of the reproduced information.

As to dependent claim 33, Chen does not teach "the system is a reading device and the mark-up language document is an e-book."

APA teaches the system is a reading device (*reading device; Specification, page 2, lines 3-4*) and the mark-up language document is an e-book ("*electronic books*" or "*e-books; Specification, page 3, lines 1-9*").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and APA because APA's teaching would have provided the enhance capability for promoting industry-wide participation of electronic publishing through training sessions, guidelines, and demonstrations of proven technology.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 18 and 29 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 01/26/2004 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Examiner believes that the newly prior art meets the limitations as claimed by Applicant.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gauvin et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,991,760	issue dated: Nov. 23, 1999
Barker	U.S Patent No. 6,029,204	issue dated: Jul. 18, 2000
Minh	U.S Patent No. 6,195,707	issue dated: Feb. 27, 2001
Martin	U.S Patent No. 6,457,060	issue dated: Sep. 24, 2002

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
April 1, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER